DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 048 617 24 CG 006 287

AUTHOR	Gamelin, Francis C.
TITLE	Cooperative Research Program Involving a Comparative Study of the Impact of Central States College Association Colleges on the Formation of Student Attitudes and Opinions. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Central States Coll. Association, Rock Island, Ill.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
BUREAU NO	BR-7-E-179
PUB DATE	31 Aug 70
GRANT	OEG-0-8-070179-0229-010
NOTE	49p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Attitudes, *College Freshmen, Colleges, College Students, Data Collection, *Longitudinal Studies, Opinions, *Research, Research Opportunities, *Student Characteristics
IDENTIFIERS	Central States College Association

ABSTRACT

This three year project was conducted to foster institutional research as a planning tool with which member colleges could improve themselves and their cooperative endeavors. The prime objective of the project was to gather baseline data on freshmen entering Central States colleges so that the changes occurring in their attitudes and opinions during college and after could be studied longitudinally. At the outset of the project it was learned that the colleges had not been gathering similar student data and were not using standardized information gathering instruments. The College Student Questionnaires and the Omnibus Personality Inventory were selected to gather baseline information on all entering freshmen of fall 1969. In addition a random sample of 50 freshmen at each college was interviewed in depth on the basis of a standard protocol and was rated by the interviewer on a standard form covering interests, attitudes, and personality characteristics. A secondary objective was to encourage institutional research among faculty members of Central States colleges by publicizing opportunities and underwriting promising small studies. The project demonstrated the value of institutional research to member institutions and established it as a regular function of the colleges and the consortium. (Author/SFK)

ED 048617

BR 7-E-179X
PA 24
HE

FINAL REPORT

Project No. 7-E-179X
Grant No. OEG-0-8-070179-0229-010

Cooperative Research Program Involving a Comparative Study of the Impact of Central States College Association Colleges on the Formation of Student Attitudes and Opinions

August 1970

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

U.S. Department of
Health, Education, and Welfare

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

CS 006 287

1

Final Report

Project No. 7-E-179X
Grant No. OEG-0-8-070179-0229-010

Cooperative Research Program

Involving a Comparative Study of the Impact of

Central States College Association Colleges

on the Formation of Student Attitudes and Opinions

Francis C. Gamelin

Central States College Association

Rock Island, Illinois

August 31, 1970

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant from the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U.S. Department of
Health, Education, and Welfare

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Summary 1

Purpose 2

Objectives 3

First Year 4

Second Year 6

Third Year 9

Future Plans 12

Accomplishments 13

Appendix A 14

Appendix B 20

Appendix C 23

Appendix D 40

Appendix E 44

Appendix F 45

Appendix G 47

Summary

This three-year project was conducted by the Central States College Association to foster institutional research as a planning tool with which member colleges could improve themselves and their cooperative endeavors. The prime objective of the project was to gather baseline data on freshmen entering Central States colleges so that the changes occurring in their attitudes and opinions during college and after could be studied longitudinally.

At the outset of the project it was learned that the colleges had not been gathering similar student data and were not using standardized information-gathering instruments. As a consequence, many instruments were appraised and a few were tried. The College Student Questionnaires and the Omnibus Personality Inventory were selected to gather baseline information on all entering freshmen of fall 1969. In addition a random sample of 50 freshmen at each college was interviewed in depth on the basis of a standard protocol and was rated by the interviewer on a standard form covering interests, attitudes, and personality characteristics.

For comparison of these data with information to be gathered on the students during their sophomore, junior, senior, and initial postgraduate years, a longitudinal design was adopted.

A secondary objective of the project was to encourage institutional research among faculty members of Central States colleges by publicizing opportunities and underwriting promising small studies. Twenty studies of pedagogical significance were supported with grants.

Among the minor accomplishments of the project were establishment of a policy on the release of data about participating institutions, demonstration of the feasibility of reporting comparative CSCA data and using it effectively, and development of an Early Reporting System for annual data on the libraries of member institutions.

In summary, the project demonstrated the value of institutional research to member institutions of the Central States College Association and established it as a regular function of the colleges and the consortium.

Purpose

According to the original proposal for this project, submitted March 1, 1967 by the Central States College Association to the U. S. Office of Education, the purpose of the project was to "assist us in intelligent planning for improvement both cooperatively and as individual institutions...(by)...pointing up the relative strengths and weaknesses of our college communities." It was anticipated that the project would demonstrate the benefits of institutional research as a regular function of the association and its member colleges.

Personnel

Before this project, none of the participating schools had a full-time institutional research officer. Only two engaged in institutional research beyond the usual data tabulation by registrars, deans, and other administrators. At most Central States colleges, therefore, commitment of a quarter-time person to the consortium project was the beginning of organized institutional research activity. The personnel appointed by the colleges to serve as Institutional Research Representatives during the project were:

Alma College	John Kimball (1967-68)
Augustana College	Francis C. Gamelin (1967-69)
	Kenneth W. Johnson (1969-70)
Carroll College	Morris N. Spencer (1967)
	Charles W. Cook (1968-70)
Gustavus Adolphus College	Daniel A. Ferber (1967-68)
	J. Don Slarks (1968-70)
Illinois Wesleyan University	Donald B. Ruthenberg (1967-68)
	Everette L. Walker (1968-69)
	Anne Meierhofer (1969-70)
Luther College	Richard G. Cole (1967-69)
	Jerrold L. Buerer (1969-70)
MacMurray College	A. Lloyd Pulliam (1967-69)
	Ruth S. Kovacs (1969-70)
Manchester College	Eldon E. Fahs (1967-70)
Millikin University	Byron L. Kerns (1967-68, 1969-70)
Mundelein College	Norbert J. Hruby (1967-68)
	Gloria Lewis (1969-70)
St. John's University	William J. VanCleve (1967-70)
Simpson College	Waller B. Wiser (1967-70)
Valparaiso University	Waldemar C. Gunther (1969-70)

By the end of the project all colleges were committed to continuing at least a fourth-time person in institutional research, one had a full-time person, two more were seeking full-time personnel, one had employed a new faculty member with half-time institutional research responsibility, and several had assigned the responsibility to an assistant to the president or dean.

The "IR Representatives" worked under the leadership of a project director. This leadership changed each year as follows:

1967-68	Donald B. Ruthenberg, Project Director
1968-69	David C. Johnson, Project Director
	Kenneth W. Johnson, Research Director
1969-70	Francis C. Gamelin, Project Director
	Kenneth W. Johnson, Research Director

The Directors met five times with the IR Representatives in 1967-68, three times in 1968-69, and four times in 1969-70. At many meetings they had the advantage of counsel from Joseph A. Murnin, Director of Educational Research for U. S. Office of Education Region V, Chicago.

During 1967-68 the Project Director met also with the executive committee of the IR Representatives, consisting of Cole, Hruby, and VanCleve. In fall 1968 this committee was replaced by an Advisory Committee appointed by the executive of CSCA at the request of the Project Director. The Advisory Committee consisted of President Elwin Farwell of Luther College and IR Representatives Hruby (replaced by Gunther in May 1969) and VanCleve. During 1969-70 this committee served to make decisions on small project proposals.

Objectives

The aim of the consortium project was an imposing one--to document the impact of participating colleges on their students' attitudes and opinions. This aim provided direction for the project, a focus for thinking and planning, but by its very nature it could be fulfilled only through a longitudinal study. Only the design for such a study could be completed during the project itself.

More modest objectives were included in the final project proposal of June 6, 1967 to the U. S. Office of Education by William VanCleve, who was slated to be project director until an enlarged assignment at St. John's University prevented his assuming major project responsibility. "Since this Association is quite young," he wrote, "a collateral and first-priority objective of its proposal to the Bureau is the establishment of vital base-line information about its members' student bodies, faculties, programs, and educational aims."

He trimmed this modest objective to even more realistic proportions for the first year's work as follows:

> "It is felt by the Board that during the first year of its operation the Association's Research Program would serve its members best if in the beginning it concentrated on experimenting in developing means of gathering reliable and useful data of a comparable nature about its member personnel and their programs under the direction of a person drawn from its own ranks. In conjunction we will experiment on each campus with selected standardized survey instruments and devise some local scales to better identify the personality typologies and religiosity factors present in student and faculty bodies."
>
> "The Director's main tasks the first year will be: (1) to help strengthen respect among faculty, administrators and students

on all campuses for well-designed studies of problems related to student welfare and achievement; (2) to increase the understanding--particularly among members of the Research Committee, the institution's presidents, and permanent faculty and staff members--of key concepts of educational measurement, survey research and personality development; and (3) to supervise and prepare a written report covering both his own and his Committee's efforts together with evaluations of the studies of local problems its executive group has supported. During the first three months of the program he will visit each campus for a period of several days to interview faculty, administrative and selected students. The written report of these interviews will be presented to the CSCA presidents at their Winter 1968 meeting and may be expected to furnish a basis for improving the consortium's usefulness to its member colleges."

First Year

Objectives. Project Director Ruthenberg and his executive committee of IR Representatives met August 18-19, 1967 to spell out the first year's objectives. They agreed upon

1. A survey of student data being gathered regularly at participating colleges.

2. A pilot collection of data on student characteristics, attitudes, and opinions through administration of the College and University Environment Scales, the College Student Questionnaires, and other instruments.

3. Analysis of each college by a pair of institutional research representatives using Chickering's *Guide for College Visits and Reporting*.

4. Conduct of workshops with faculty and student groups to develop college programs of institutional research.

5. Sponsorship of local research.

6. Use of consultants to the project.

7. Supervision of project work by the institutional research representatives.

8. Reporting of data to the Board candidly but with protection of institutional anonymity.

Accomplishments. Ruthenberg's thorough reports on first-year activities show that all these objectives were reached.

1. Survey of Data Available. VanCleve prepared a questionnaire and tabulated the responses from IR Representatives on the kinds and format of information available about students at each college. See Appendix A. He found that only seven of

35 items were tabulated at all Central States colleges. More disquieting, he said, was the discovery that so few colleges were using standardized information-gathering instruments such as the College Student Questionnaires. This survey verified the need for uniform data collection on standardized instruments.

2. Uniform Data Collection. Numerous instruments were examined by the IR Representatives in their search for the kind of data that would be most helpful to their colleges. By the end of the year, three were tried out:

    a. College and University Environment Scales--sophomores and seniors
    b. Institutional Functioning Inventory--faculty
    c. Survey of Educational Status and Progress--sophomores and seniors

    The latter two instruments were tried because the opportunity arose to participate in the final stage of their development. Arrangements were also made to administer the College Student Questionnaire to all entering freshmen in September 1968.

3. Analysis of Colleges. Each college in the consortium was visited by the project director and an institutional research representative. Observations and interview data were gathered on the basis of Chickering's *Guide for College Visits and Reporting*. Evaluative summaries were prepared and submitted to the presidents.

4. College Workshops on Institutional Research. The project director met with the faculties of several colleges about the project, especially about small project grants available to individual faculty members, and he held major meetings with the presidents, academic deans, and deans of students.

5. Faculty Research. Criteria for small project or "seed grant" awards to faculty members were established, a substantial list of suggested projects was prepared, and eight faculty proposals were funded. See Appendix B.

6. Consultants. The project director obtained assistance from numerous sources by letter. Continuous help was made available by Joseph Murnin, Director, Educational Research, USOE Region V. Arthur Chickering met with the IR Representatives for a day about the overall nature of the project. Robert Hassenger met with them twice.

7. Supervision. The project director provided effective leadership and consultative supervision to all IR Representatives. Only one regular report was requested of the representatives, a quarterly time and effort report required by the USOE regional office.

8. Reporting of Data. The project director reported at all three

meetings of the Central States College Association board in 1967-68. He found a strong interest within the board to protect the anonymity of individual institutions and to avoid comparative evaluation of them.

In perspective of later developments, the first year of the project achieved not only the objectives of the project director and his executive committee, but it also developed the IR Representatives into a keenly interested, alert, cooperative team. One evidence of high-level interest was the participation by three of the IR Representatives before the end of the year in a USOE-sponsored National Research Training Institute.

With respect to cooperation, the IR Representatives encountered all the usual initial problems--developing similar team goals, defining roles, sensing the influence of limited data upon perceptions of institutions, etc. However, the problems were resolved. As a consequence it was possible to use the second year of the project to develop a longitudinal research program with assurance that in the third year and thereafter all the colleges would implement it effectively.

Second Year

Transition. The change in project directors from Donald Ruthenberg to David Johnson was made so smoothly and efficiently as not even to delay implementation of the plan for September 1968 to explore the value of the College Student Questionnaires, Part I. Before assuming office, Johnson met with Ruthenberg, Murnin of USOE, and the president of CSCA; he got acquainted with project records; and he attended the National Training Institute at Traverse City, Michigan with three IR Representatives. Shortly after taking over, he met with the IR Representatives, presidents, and academic deans of the colleges; developed a division of labor with his colleague, Research Director Kenneth Johnson; and attended a meeting of all administrators of similar institutional research groups in Region V.

Objectives. The direction of the study remained a search for the impact of the colleges on their students. Four main objectives emerged for 1968-69:

1. To explore the utility of information gathered on standardized instruments.

2. To develop a pattern for compilation of comparative data on the colleges.

3. To design a longitudinal study of changes in the values, attitudes, opinions, and beliefs of CSCA students.

4. To encourage faculty research.

Accomplishments. The objectives for the year again were achieved.

1. Utility of Information. Seven of the colleges made specific use of test results, as shown in the following summary submitted

as information in the agenda materials for the January 1970 CSCA board meeting:

Augustana. The results on the College and University Environment Scales were distributed to the faculty at a regular business meeting and were discussed briefly by Kenneth Johnson, research director of the CSCA institutional research project.

Gustavus. Faculty members were invited to a special meeting at which David Johnson, director of the CSCA institutional research project, presented results on the Institutional Functioning Inventory. By means of the overhead projector Johnson described the IFI scales, presented mean scores for the Gustavus faculty, and compared these with means for CSCA colleges and means provided by Educational Testing Service for 37 colleges. Johnson also covered the positive and negative responses that applied to Gustavus.

Manchester. Eldon Fahs, assistant to the president and institutional research representative, made a convocation presentation to the faculty and student body of project data, especially on the College and University Environment Scales and the College Student Questionnaire.

Millikin. At a preschool administrative retreat, Byron Kerns, vice-president for institutional research, presented mimeographed reports of results on the College and University Environment Scales and the Institutional Functioning Inventory (over 20 pages in each report). There was considerable discussion of the areas of strength and weakness as revealed by the inventories.

Mundelein. Gloria Lewis, director of research, presented data from the Institutional Functioning Inventory at a general faculty meeting, stressing the positive results. At curriculum meetings during the year she attempted to introduce data when relevant. Small item reports were made in The Faculty Line, a weekly newsletter.

St. John's. William VanCleve, director of testing and counseling, is using the data from last year as a basis for comparing and highlighting results on the same instruments with fall 1969 freshmen. He has released the first of a series of multilithed reports to the St. John's staff, prominently marked on the cover, "Confidential: Dissemination of Report Contents Off-Campus is Not Authorized."

Simpson. Waller Wiser, dean of academic affairs and institutional research representative, first held a special meeting with department chairmen to present data from the Institutional Functioning Inventory and the College and University Environment Scales and to discuss possible implications. "The department chairmen found the information particularly useful in assessing some of the goals and objectives of the college (and in) getting some sense of student and faculty perceptions of

various characteristics of the institution." Next the data were discussed with the student senate. Finally, the data formed the basis of the spring meeting of the Board of Trustees. In addition, the Administrative Council has used the data along with material from the College Student Questionnaires for decision-making.

2. Compilation of Data. The project director tabulated the following information for all CSCA institutions, usually in parallel columns for easy comparison:

    Institutional Data
        Governing Board Chairman
        Presidents
        Deans
        Other Administrative Officers
        Enrollment Summaries
        Credit Hour Production
        Faculty Data
        Library
    College and University Environment Scales (CUES)
    College Student Questionnaires, Part I (CSQ)
    Survey of Educational Status and Progress (SESP)
    Institutional Functioning Inventory (IFI)

The compilation was an impressive source of data on the CSCA colleges. Because the volume was prepared for presidents, deans, and institutional research representatives only, the colleges were identified by name rather than by code, a feature which led to some expression of negative feelings. Also, much of the data, having been gathered for exploratory purposes without fastidious attention to factors like sampling, was of doubtful validity or reliability. As a consequence, the data deserved a lesser aura of authenticity at this experimental stage of the project than the format of publication suggested. Nevertheless, the event demonstrated that comparative data could be compiled in a thought-provoking manner illuminating to CSCA schools.

3. Longitudinal Study. At the beginning of the second year, the IR Representatives were asked to recommend, on the basis of their first year's experience in the project, the kind of study they would like to see initiated during it. Research Director Kenneth Johnson then developed a proposal for a longitudinal study (Appendix C). The proposal contemplated gathering extensive baseline data on one freshman class and on their CSCA institutions, then observing changes in the students and the institutions for several years.

The IR Representatives accepted the research director's proposal for implementation beginning in fall 1969.

4. Faculty Research. Proposals from faculty members were solicited on the same basis as in the first year of the project. The

research director wrote a Manual for Research as a guide for preparing proposals, he advised inquirers, and he evaluated proposals that were submitted. Four proposals were funded, as indicated in Appendix B.

Consultants. During the second year of the project Earl McGrath was called upon twice as a general consultant. Joseph Murnin continued to assist the IR Representatives. John Centra and Richard Peterson of Educational Testing Service helped with interpretation of results on the College and University Environment Scales and on the Institutional Functioning Inventory, and Charles Elton of American College Testing Program helped with interpretation of results on the Survey of Educational Status and Progress (now the Institutional Self-Study Survey).

Evaluation of Second Year. By the end of the second year of the study all the groundwork was laid for a longitudinal study of CSCA students and for an ongoing program of cooperative institutional research among CSCA colleges. A study design was adopted, instruments were selected, and procedures were approved. The IR Representatives looked forward eagerly to productive teamwork in the third year of the project.

Third Year

Leadership. Since the new project director, Francis C. Gamelin, had participated as an IR Representative the first two years, he was familiar with plans for the third year. Moreover, the research director of the second year, Kenneth Johnson, was available during the third year, so no transitional problems were encountered.

Objectives and Procedures. Since the major objective of the year was to implement plans for the first year of the longitudinal study and conclude the three-year USOE-supported project, Gamelin and Johnson agreed upon the following division of responsibility:

Johnson:

1. Arrange for scoring and analytical services on standardized instruments.

2. Prepare two interview protocols and explain them to the IR Representatives.

3. Analyze data collected in fall 1969.

4. Prepare a proposal for a followup project.

Gamelin:

5. Prepare for, conduct, and follow up meetings and other contacts with IR Representatives.

6. Prepare budgets and reports for the CSCA Board and carry out Board requests.

7. Maintain contacts with and make reports to the U. S. Office of Education, Region V.

8. Stimulate, process, and follow up faculty research proposals.

9. Arrange for spring and fall 1970 followup testing and interviews.

10. Prepare the final report on the project.

Accomplishments. Through excellent cooperation from the IR Representatives of all twelve colleges, all the desired baseline data on students were collected and analyzed, the faculty research program was doubled, and the continuation of institutional research after this project was assured.

1. Acquisition of Data. All new freshmen at all Central States colleges in the fall of 1969 were asked to complete the following inventories:

   College Student Questionnaires, Part I
   Omnibus Personality Inventory

   Then a random sample of 50 freshmen at each college was chosen for interviewing. Each interview followed essentially the same protocol (see Appendix D). The interviewer (the IR Representative at most colleges) rated each interviewee on a standard form (see Appendix E) and wrote a summary of his interview impressions. After all 50 interviews, the interviewer also wrote a one-page summary of the characteristics of the incoming freshman class as revealed in the interviews. All interviewers felt that the data gathered by this process was extremely valuable, possibly more valuable than the inventory data.

   In addition, a sample of at least half of the faculty at each college was asked to complete the Institutional Functioning Inventory in order to provide a picture of the institution through the eyes of experienced members. However, inadequate faculty responses at several colleges required that this part of the study be dropped for analytic purposes. Instead, the president of each college was offered consultative services based upon the strengths and weaknesses suggested in Institutional Functioning Inventory results.

2. Analysis of Data. Educational Testing Service supplied item and scale scores on the College Student Questionnaires, Part I, by individual, by college, by sex, and for CSCA totals. Psychological Corporation supplied similar scores for the Omnibus Personality Inventory.

   Kenneth Johnson analyzed these data, along with the aforementioned interview ratings and summaries, in order to provide a baseline for longitudinal studies of the same students or comparative studies of successive incoming classes.

3. Release of Data. One of the problems noted during the second year of the study, agreement upon conditions for release of

project data, was resolved by development of an appropriate policy. The policy was drafted by the project director, amended and approved by the IR Representatives, and adopted by the CSCA Board. See Appendix F.

In addition, the Board received three reports during the year on the status of the project and future possibilities.

4. Information System. The IR Representatives felt that data gathered in fall 1969 not only provided a baseline for longitudinal and comparative studies, but that it also demonstrated the value of a computerized information system using standard data elements from all CSCA colleges.

   In examining available and developing information systems, the project director arrived at two conclusions: first, that current systems are usually restricted to management information and aimed at cost-analysis; second, that the system being developed by the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE) is most promising. As a consequence, CSCA colleges were encouraged to participate in WICHE at the information-receiving level while the consortium enrolled on an active level.

5. Library Data. Early in the third year, the project director was contacted by CSCA librarians about compiling their fall reports to the U. S. Office of Education more quickly than the national tabulation can be made available. As a consequence, an Early Reporting System was developed. Within three weeks of a request to the librarians for material they wanted included in the tabulation, a comparative table for the eleven interested colleges was distributed. It included the statistics cited in Appendix G.

   The request for this tabulation suggests that the CSCA Institutional Research Program has achieved some visibility among the faculties and that interested groups of faculty members may request service from it.

6. Faculty Research. Small project research proposals were solicited from faculty members in essentially the same way as during the previous years of the project. A simpler advertisement of the program was circulated through the Association newsletter and through the IR Representatives. The project director advised inquirers, processed proposals through the Research Advisory Committee, and pressed for completion of the four projects funded during the previous year. Eight new proposals were funded in 1969-70, as cited in Appendix B.

Future Plans

The enthusiasm for institutional research generated by this project will continue undiminished. Next year all CSCA colleges will continue to study their impact upon their students. At every college a faculty or administrative staff member will devote at least one-fourth time to

institutional research. These personnel, as IR Representatives to CSCA, plan to follow the freshmen of fall 1969 as contemplated in the longitudinal study design (see Appendix C). An earnest of their intentions was their administration of the College Student Questionnaires Part II in spring 1970 to their interview samples, and, for cross-validation purposes at four colleges, to an additional random sample of 50.

Next fall the IR Representatives will conduct second interviews with their original sample of subjects and administer the College and University Environment Scales to all sophomores. Resulting data conbined with CSQ II data from spring 1970 should tell something of the change that occurred in the subjects of this project during their freshman year at C Central States colleges.

In addition to implementation of the longitudinal study, CSCA colleges will explore the WICHE Information System as rapidly as it is adapted to small colleges, and they will repeat the Early Reporting System for library statistics. Only the faculty research grants included in the current project may be discontinued. However, some member colleges will support a similar program locally.

Accomplishments

In summary, this project has enabled the colleges of the Central States College Association to make notable gains in educational research. These gains include the following:

1. All the colleges in the consortium have initiated programs of educational research under the leadership of a part-time or full-time staff member.

2. A mechanism has been developed, an Institutional Research Representatives committee, to plan, conduct, and promote educational research in the consortium.

3. The feasibility of uniform data collection and comparative reporting has been established and a policy has been adopted on the release of data.

4. The utility of institutional research data and CSCA norms has been demonstrated.

5. Vital baseline information about the student bodies of member colleges has been established.

6. A cooperative longitudinal research program for the twelve colleges has been planned and launched.

7. Interest and skill in educational research has been increased among many administrative and teaching faculty members of Central States colleges.

Thus, the project has been very successful in establishing institutional research as an ongoing function of colleges in the Central States College Association.

SAINT JOHN'S UNIVERSITY
College of Arts and Sciences
COLLEGEVILLE, MINNESOTA 56321

Dean of Students

DATE: November 8, 1967

MEMO TO: Institutional Representatives, CSCA

FROM: William J. Van Cleve

RE: Summary of Data Available Survey

I enclose the summary I have prepared from the survey I sent to each of you on October 5. You will note that on the first page I have indicated the name of your particular school and the code letter I have assigned to it. In view of the fact that we have a commitment to exchange information and at the same time to preserve the anonymity of schools to the extent possible I thought it would be interesting and worthwhile to identify schools by code letter so that each of us can know how he responded in relationship to the other institutions without in turn knowing how a given other school answers. True enough, there is nothing in this study -- in my opinion -- which should cause any school to be concerned about dissemination; still, future reports may warrant this kind of format.

Each of you has, I believe, a copy of the survey since I sent you two of the original forms and you will doubtless want to refer to it in studying these answers. Here I offer a few observations which we can discuss at our meeting on December 6 at Augustana if you wish.

1. We are now in a position to prepare for all 12 schools a distribution of SAT scores similar to example 1. A. on the survey form for the classes of 1966 and 1967. I recommend that we do so and will be willing to compile an all-schools profile if you agree to have one at our December meeting.

2. We seem similarly to be able -- 10 out of 12 schools, question I. B. 1 -- to prepare for the freshmen entering in 1966 and 1967 a profile based on high school rank deciles. I suggest that this also be done. Item I. D. indicates that a majority of schools could furnish data on at least this Fall's entering freshmen class on: Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17 and 18. Combined profiles of these items would also be worth having.

3. Under II, Test Data Available, I find the most disquieting result of this survey. If the information reported is accurate our institutions collectively have little faith in standardized instruments save for the SAT. I was particularly surprised to find such little use of the college and University Environment Scales and CSQ. With this summary I am enclosing for each of you a copy of CUES and of CSQ parts 1 and 2. I would propose that at our December meeting we discuss the possibility of administering CUES to a 5% stratified random sampling of our student bodies and a 20% sample of our regular teaching faculties. Since scoring service for this averages $1.00 a head, I roughly estimate the cost would be about $1200 including a report. Each of you should have in your Counseling Service or Testing Office a Technical Manual on both CUES and CSQ. If not, a line to ETS in Evanston will bring you one.

Ideally, the College Student Questionnaire is given to freshmen: Part 1 during orientation and part 2 late in the Spring. We gave it here at Saint John's last year and observed change on a number of scales over the nine months. We cannot, of course, attribute that change to any conscious action in terms of our curricular design. Even a study of item percentages on CSQ can yield some thought-provoking information. Here are some examples of what I mean. On CSQ, part 1, our freshmen on question 188 -- Labor Unions Do More Harm Than Good -- strongly agreed with the statement in 16% of the cases in Autumn and in 11% of the cases in May. So far as their reaction to lynching is concerned, in September 9% indicated they would be indifferent or would care depending on who was being lynched. Nine months later that number was virtually unchanged -- 8%. On the other hand, in September 58% indicated they knew almost nothing about the history of painting and that number declined to 42% in May. Indeed, we do teach, as we always have, factual information but whether we influence attitudes pro or con is yet a matter of debate.

I cannot resist saying in closing that the variety of tests we do use on occasion in individual situations plus the lack of any reported standardized institutional testing programs poses for CSCA schools in my judgment a real challenge. I would hope that we can begin confronting it on December 6.

WJVC:rh

Enclosure

CENTRAL STATES COLLEGE ASSOCIATION

Project on Student Attitudes

SUMMARY OF DATA AVAILABLE SURVEY (10-05-67)

(FOR _____ CODE LETTER ____)

I. A. S.A.T. Score Distributions For Entering Freshmen: (Example I. A.)
At fifty point intervals, spread by Verbal, Math; by Sex, (N and Percent):

SCHOOLS

1. For Fall, 1967?

ALL (12) NONE (0)

2. For Classes Prior to '67?

-1964,65,66
B,E,J,K,P,R,V,X (8)
-1961 to date
H (1)
-1966 to date
Q (1)
-1965 to date
T,Z (2)

3. Other Factors Then Sex?

(a) -Major
Most (9), not: K,R,X (3)

(b) -Size of HS Grad. Class
Most (10), not: H,K (2)

(c) -Religious Affiliation
Most (11), not: P (1)

(d^1) -Size of Hometown
Only B,R (2)

(d^2) -State/Country of Origin
Only B,R (2)

4. Punch Card Data?

(a) -Name
Most (8), not: H,P,V,X (4)

(b) -Unique ID No.
Most (8), not: H,P,V,X (4)

(c) -SAT V & M Scores
Half (6), not: H,J,P,V,X,Z (6

(d) -HS Rank
-Deciles K,R (2)
-Quintiles (P) ((1))
-Quartiles (0)
-Absolute Nos. B,E,P (3)
-No Rank H,J,P,Q,V,X,Z (7)

(School P has Abs. Nos. too.)

(e) -Date of Birth
Some (5), not: B,H,J,P,V,X,Z (7)

(f) -Other Punch Data
-Coll. Major Code: B,T (2)
-Financial Need: T (1)

Note: 4. f. was obscurely worded. Data usually means numeric information or codes capable of process manipulation. Most answers to f. indicated alphabetic (e.g. name of HS) information.

5[1]. Punch Card Equipt.

-1620: B,J
-402 or 403: Q,T
-360 + 40 + Time Sharing: E
-1130: Z
-No Equipt. (presumably no Service Bureau): H,V
-KP, Sorter (access Computer): K
-No Equipt. Service Bureau or Co-op Sharing Plan: P,R,X

5[2]. Punch Card Use.
Answers to this question few and not summarizeable.

I. B. H.S. Rank Distributions For Entering Freshmen: (Example I.B)
At decile intervals, by Sex (N and Percent).

SCHOOLS

1. For Fall, 1967?
-Deciles: Most (10)
-Quintiles: B,P (2)

2. For Classes Prior to '67?
-1964,65,66 (Quintiles) B,P (2)
-1964,65,66 (Deciles) Most (9)
-1965,66 (Deciles) T (1)

3. Other Factors Than Sex?
(a) -Major
Most (7), not: K,P,R,V,X (5)
(b) -Size of HS Grad Class
Most (11), not: P (1)
(c) -Religious Affiliation
Most (10), not: P,V (2)
(d) -Size of Hometown; State of Origin
Only B (1)

I. C. SAT and HSR Data on non-enrolled First-time Freshmen:

1. Formally denied admission?
-All (12) None (0)

2. Accepted but did not register
-Most (11), not: R (1)

I. D. Other data on Fall '67 First-time Freshmen Enrollees:

1. HS Grad Class by stated size intervals?
-All (12)

2. Hometown by stated size intervals?
-Most (7)
Hometown by other size intervals?
-Only B (1)
Cannot furnish:
-Same H,V,X,Z (4)

3. Home State or Country?
-All (12)

4.	By religious denomination?	-Most (11), not: P (1)
5.	By birthdate interval?	-Most (11), not: X (1)
6.	Single and married?	-All (12)
7.	Living in residence halls?	-All (12)
8.	Living in school-owned Fraternities and Sororities?	-Most H,J,K,Q,R,T,V (7)
	No Fraternities, Sororities?	-Some B,E,P,X,Z (5)
9.	Living in Privately-owned Fraternities and Sororities?	-Half H,J,K,Q,R,V (6)
	None Privately-owned?	-Only T (1)
10.	Non-U. S. citizens?	-All (12)
11.	White, Negro, non-Caucausian?	-Most (10), not: R,V (2)
12.	Number planning majors in each field?	-Most (11), Uncertain: X (1)
13.	Number with Alumni relationship?	-Most (11), not: X (1)
14.	Brothers & sisters (or children)?	-Most (10), not: Q,Z (2)
15.	Nationality backgrounds:	
	Either or both parents non-U.S.?	-Only E,T (2)
	Either or both grandparents non-U.S.?	-None (0)
16.	Ethnic backgrounds:	
	From HS transcript?	-Only P (1)
	Other classifying scheme?	-Almost none (11)
	Foreign Language spoken at home?	-Only R (1)
17.	Parents' formal educational attainments (Example I-D or close variant)?	-Most (8), not: K,V,X,Z (4)
18.	Fathers' occupational category (Example 18. or close variant)? (Some responses here were obscure.)	-Most (10), not: E,V (2)

II. Test Data Available:

C O D E L I S T

A - Have For Individuals
B - Frequency Dist. & Profile
C - Punch Card
D - Admin. To All
E - Admin. Selectively
F - Plan Using This Year
G - Did Use, Do Not Now

	Code:	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1.	a. SAT	12	10	5	9	0	0	0
	b. Achievements	1	0	0	0	5	0	0
	c. College Comprehensives	1	1	0	1	2	0	0
	d. Advance Placements	2	0	0	0	6	0	0
2.	a. CUES	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
	b. CSQ - Part I	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
	c. CSQ - Part II	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
	d. GRE - National Prg.	2	1	1	1	1	0	0
	e. GRE - Institutional Prg.	3	3	1	3	3	0	0
	f. NTE	2	1	1	1	1	0	0
3.	OPI	1	1	0	1	0	0	0
4.	Davis	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
5.	SVIT	3	0	0	1	3	1	1
6.	MMPI	1	0	0	0	2	0	0
7.	CMHI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8.	CTMM	1	0	0	1	1	0	1
9.	CET	2	1	1	1	0	0	0

Other Tests Used (occasionally, regularly; with selected groups, individuals)

WAIS (1)
Otis Quick Scoring (1)
Gordon Personal Profile (1)
SIT (1)
Edwards Personal Preference Scale (1)
Kuder Interest Inventory (2)
Weilgart Tests (1)
Purdue English Tests (2)
SCAT (Freshmen) (1)
STEP (Frosh & Soph) (1)

Note: It did not appear feasible to code-identify schools in this table.

APPENDIX B

SMALL PROJECT GRANTS

Criteria for Small Project Proposals

1. Proposals to study some aspect of a CSCA college, its curriculum, instruction, personnel, students, or other characteristics, are eligible for grants.

2. Proposals must be capable of completion by August 31, 1970.

3. The request for funding any single proposal may not exceed $1200.

4. Grants may not be used for replacement of salary or for conducting meetings, conferences, or seminars.

5. Proposals must include provision for written dissemination of methodology and findings to appropriate personnel in the member schools.

6. The application procedure is essentially that described in the manual, "Small Project Research," published by the Office of Education, Bureau of Research, November 1966, and available from the Project Representative on each member campus. These procedures include compliance with Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

7. Proposals may be submitted to the CSCA office at any time. Because they will be xeroxed in the office for distribution to all CSCA institutional research directors, only a single reproduceable copy need be submitted; however, 15 copies of any non-reproduceable material in the proposal should be submitted.

8. Proposals will be reviewed by an evaluation committee in order of receipt. Decisions or reactions may be expected in less than a month.

10/7/69

Small Project Grants Awarded

Some of the institutional research funds awarded our association by the U. S. Office of Education were designated for small project awards to faculty members. According to USOE rules, awards could be made for studying any aspect of a college--curriculum, instruction, students, etc.--but could not be used for replacement of salary or for conducting meetings, conferences, or seminars.

An advisory committee of three was established to examine proposals and approve or disapprove them. This year the committee consisted of Dr. Elwin Farwell, Dr. Waldemar Gunther, and Mr. William VanCleve. Each year the committee has approved several proposals and either rejected some or advised against their submission in final form. Awards were made as follows:

1967-68

1. Bonnie S. Brooks, Millikin University, $1317.25. "A Longitudinal Study of Perceptual Change Among Students."

2. Francis C. Gamelin, Augustana College, $1400. "A Search of the Literature on Student Values."

3. Norbert Hruby, Mundelein College, $1250. "The Generation Gap: Its Impact on Mundelein from Within."

4. Ronald D. Kapp, Alma College, $280. "Inadequacies of College for the Black Student."

5. John Kimball, Alma College. $982.18. "An Evaluation of the Effects of a Change from a Semester to a 3-3 Calendar."

6. Clair G. Kloster, Luther College, $1250. "Exit Testing of Seniors Using Form F of the Omnibus Personality Inventory."

7. Michele Tolela and Duane Dove, Manchester College, $300. Sex, Status, and Leadership Effectiveness."

8. William J. VanCleve, St. John's University, $1177.50. "Student and Faculty Appraisal of an Educational Innovation: Survey of the First Interim."

1968-69

1. W. Clark Eldridge, Simpson College, $822. "The Impact of College Interims in Negro History Upon Self-Concepts and Attitudes of Participating White and Black Students."

2. William F. Greable, Simpson College, $1165. "Conditioning Verbal Responses in a Group Setting: The Relative Effect of Two Reinforcers in Three Different Sizes of Groups in Shaping Positive Self-Reference Statements and in Improving Self-Concept."

3. Byron L. Kerns, Millikin University, $1100. "A Study of Changes in Dogmatism and Opinionation of College Students During Their Freshman Year."

4. Karen Kent Shirer, Valparaiso University, $1080. "Syllabus for an Introduction to Music in a Basic Comprehensive Course."

1969-70

1. Donald R. Bonney, Luther College, $240. "The Effects of Content, Course Structure, and Student Personality Traits in the Teaching of Introductory Economics."

2. Rolf Craft, Luther College, $295. "A Proposal To Study the Efficiency of the Alternative Financial Aid Programs in Achieving the Goals of Individual Colleges."

3. Allen C. Deeter and Eldon E. Fahs, Manchester College, $600. "Students' and Graduates' Evaluations of Manchester's Peace Studies Program, 1948-70, Especially As These Relate to Vocational Choice and Future Educational Experiences."

4. William F. Eifrig, Jr., Valparaiso University, $400. "A Programmed Course of Instruction in Music Using Tape-recorded Materials."

5. Elwin D. Farwell and Clair G. Kloster, Luther College, $146. "Parent-student Differences in Religious Concepts."

6. William F. Greable, Simpson College, $1184. "Conditioning Verbal Behavior: The Effect of Experimenter Baseline Behavior on the Emission of Opinion Statements by Male and Female Undergraduate Students."

7. Clifford L. Meints, Simpson College, $856. "Teaching Line Notation of Chemical Compounds Via Programmed Text."

8. Richard W. Wienhorst, Valparaiso University, $1177. "Harmonic Perception: a Programmed Approach."

APPENDIX C

A PROPOSAL FOR A LONGITUDINAL STUDY OF STUDENTS

K. W. Johnson, Ph.D.

It is the purpose of this investigation to examine the major factors that relate to the development of liberal arts students at the twelve colleges making up the Central States College Association. These institutions, dedicated to higher education in the liberal arts, are linked together for the purposes of mutual enrichment and cooperation. All colleges in the consortium are located within five middle-western states, and all are "church related." There are four Lutheran, three Methodist, two Presbyterian, two Roman Catholic, and one Church of the Brethren. The twelve central states colleges enroll approximately 20,000 students, with individual institutions enrolling between one and two thousand.

Although traditionally studies of student development have concentrated upon intellective factors and their relationship to academic achievement, this investigation recognizes academic achievement as only one important aspect of student development. It will be the objective of the major investigators of this research study to examine a number of other areas of development considered desirable outcomes of college education. These will be specified in the body of this proposal.

In the area of research in higher education three broad factors are recognized as centrally important to the development of students: one, the nature of the student at the time he enters college, that is, what he is like in terms of intellect, emotion, attitude and motivation; two, the totality of his educational experiences in college both inside and outside the classroom, including significant relationships with his peers, with the

faculty and in the community at large; three, the college itself--its facilities, its faculty, its traditions, in short, its total "operant atmosphere," i.e. the college as he perceives it. Taken together in their proper proportions as the student experiences college life, these broad concerns will largely determine the course of his development. These are the "treatment effect" that hypothetically produce the "educated man."

In essence, this investigation will aim intensive and prolonged research activity at the student and his college experiences. Initially it will be the aim of the study to understand what the student is like at the time he enters college. In order to achieve this end, we shall gather all available information about him by means of cumulative records, application forms, questionnaires and interviews. We shall also use appropriate ability, achievement and personality tests with an entire entering class at the twelve C.S.C.A. colleges in September, 1969. In this way, we shall accumulate a comprehensive pool of information that will allow us to describe definitively one whole college class at each institution. We shall then follow the class as it moves along through the four college years.

In regard to the educational process itself, we shall attempt to discover the nature of the educational experiences lived out by our students at our colleges. We shall accomplish this by means of observation, interviews and questionnaires. We want to know what the students' experiences actually are and how they affect him: we can only know this by staying in close contact with him over a period of four years.

At the same time that we are attempting to understand the student and the nature of his educational experiences, we shall also be studying the institutions and the ways in which the institutions endeavor to accomplish their stated goals with students. Although the major interest of this investigation is with student perceptions, no study of student perceptions

is meaningful unless it stands side by side with faculty perceptions and possibly, administrative perceptions. Some of these perceptions can be gathered from a study of college catalogs and of curricula, but others may be gathered by means of interviews and questionnaires. We shall use observations, interviews and questionnaires along with official statements of goals and purposes in catalogs to fill out the picture of institutional functioning.

In these ways, then, this investigation will involve an intensive examination of the student at input, of his educational experiences and of the college he attends.

Focus of the Study

Although a longitudinal study as outlined in this proposal has as its objective the examination of all major factors relating to student development, the specific focus of the study will be upon the development of values. The C.S.C.A. colleges have long espoused the objective of broad development of intellectual and emotional resources for their students in contrast to the narrower goals of vocational and technological institutions. They view man as a valuing being who is confronted by a lifetime of choices--choices which are often extremely complex and require the exercise of the highest forms of intelligence and wisdom. Living in a world of rapid, and at times, radical social and technological change, he must choose between a bewildering array of alternatives. On his choices may hang his own survival and the enhancement of his life--and, at the same time, of necessity, the survival and enhancement of his fellow human beings. His perceptions of himself and of external reality, therefore, must be accurate and reliable. It is the development of these capabilities that C.S.C.A. colleges hold as central goals, and it will be the aim of this investigation to discover to

what extent C.S.C.A. institutions are accomplishing these goals.

The C.S.C.A. Student Research Questions

This investigation will seek to discover what sort of students enter the colleges constituting the Central States College Association. We shall try to answer the following questions:

1. What is the level of intellectual functioning of the students who enter our colleges?
2. What is the level of achievement accomplished by the applicants?
3. From what socio-economic backgrounds do they come?
4. What are the salient personality characteristics which characterize the students at input?
5. What are the students' attitudes toward themselves, their fellowmen, and the world in which they live?

Question one has to do with level of intellectual functioning. It has been assumed that college students in the liberal arts are persons of superior intellectual ability. What evidence do we have that this is true? What is the range of intellectual ability? What is the relationship between level of intellectual functioning and academic achievement? A measure of intellectual functioning will be used to determine level of functioning.

Question two has to do with level of academic achievement of entering students. Here the question is, What does the student know when he enters college? What are the tools he brings with him to college that will allow him to benefit from the college program? We are interested in ascertaining the extent to which the student has developed during elementary school, junior high and high school. To answer these questions we shall examine cumulative records, and give particular attention to the correlation of high school grade point average and Scholastic Aptitude Test scores in Verbal and Mathematics areas. Thus we shall be able to understand something about

precise areas of development and their relationship to success already achieved as indicated by grades.

Question three emphasizes socio-economic factors. It is widely recognized in research that such factors have a direct bearing upon the level of development of students up to the time they enter college. We shall therefore attempt to ascertain:

Level of family income

Father's and mother's occupations

Level of parents' education

Student's birthplace and parents' birthplace

Student's religious preference

Number and age of siblings

Student's educational history

Race, sex, nationality

Cultural interests and activities in the home

et. al.

In short, we shall endeavor to assess the major socio-economic factors that may have a bearing upon student development. These data will be gathered by means of a comprehensive survey questionnaire, the College and University Educational Survey. This survey will be administered to the entire entering class at each of the twelve C.S.C.A. colleges.

Question four has to do with the measurement of personality characteristics supposedly relating to student development. In this regard, the Omnibus Personality Inventory, developed for the purpose of measuring dimensions of personality related to college education, offers an ideal structure for our purposes. It will allow us to assess level of ego functioning: interest in and enjoyment of the thought process--motivation toward

intellectual activity and learning; interest in the employment of the scientific method in understanding phenomena--scientific mindedness; interest in art and music, literature and philosophy--and the kind of aestnetic experiences participated in; need for independence for the self and others--that is, "operant autonomy" both in thought and action; complexity of personality, that is, the extent to which one can tolerate ambiguity and enjoy diversity in his experiences; flexibility particularly related to religious concepts, dogmas and practices; impulse expression--the amount of energy the person has to seek satisfaction of basic impulse needs; reality orientation--the degree to which the individual interprets his experiences along reality dimensions in contrast to need distortions; social interaction--the manner in which the individual relates to others--participation or withdrawal; intrapersonal and interpersonal sensitivity--the manner in which a person presents himself to others.

All of the above areas are hypothetically related to the educational process as conceived in this proposal. Development in this sense involves a multi-dimensional process of interdependent and interacting factors: intellectual and emotional. Such a process obviously involves a great deal more than the development of the mind: the implication is that higher education, which has as its goal the full development of human beings, has an impact upon both intellect and emotions and involves changes in personality and social behavior. The Omnibus Personality Inventory will be used to measure students at input and at output (pre-and-post) in order to evaluate personality development over the college years.

Question five has to do with student attitudes and expectations. We shall attempt to appraise the attitudes of the student toward:

Himself--his "self-concept"

His parents and his home: significant models

His siblings

His religion

His society--society as he experiences it

His life goals

Education in general--college in particular

It can be assumed on the basis of data on hand that parental attitudes toward education are extremely important when one tries to assess student attitudes toward education. Not as clearly understood, but equally important, is the student's attitudes toward his parents. Since we do not have access directly to parental attitudes, we shall concern ourselves with students' perceptions of parent-attitudes. Such perceptions of parental attitudes may have a direct bearing upon student attitudes toward academic performance and scholarship, vocational goals and intellectual interests. Perhaps most important of all, parents who serve as "intellectual models" for their children have immense importance since such children seek to pattern themselves after them. It will be of interest to discover the influence of such parents--we shall try to assess the intellectual and cultural atmosphere of the home.

In much the same way, we shall want to measure the role of older siblings in the home. Oftentimes, older siblings constitute models for college students. We shall ask about number of, position of, brightness of siblings in the homes from which our students come.

Obviously, in colleges that are "church-related," the role of religion is of importance. We deem assessment of the religious dimension as an essential element in our study. We shall wish to inquire into the strength of religious identification. We would like to know the nature of student religious practices and beliefs. We are interested in whether or not religion as a significant cultural dimension truly influences the course of a student's

life. We would be interested in knowing whether religious convictions and activities constrict development particularly in the sense of actual or imagined limitations, or whether religion as a cultural phenomenon lends support to educational aims and goals. We would be interested in examining religious identification, beliefs and practices as possible sources of cultural enrichment which might help us understand student moral and ethical values as well as esthetic interests, i.e. interest in art, music and literature.

In the present state of social unrest, student attitudes toward society are often regarded as highly negative. Movements toward social reform are gaining perhaps their greatest supporters from college age youth. We shall therefore wish to inquire into the students' attitudes toward society as they experience it, and society as they feel it should be.

We wish to investigate what students see as the "good life." We regard student interests and preferences as highly significant. In this connection we are interested in the symbols, images and myths that inform and enrich their imagination. We shall ask about student reading habits: What do they choose to read for pleasure? We would like to know the nature and extent of student cultural activities: attendance at plays, musical concerts, at lectures, at exhibitions and museums. We would like to know what hobbies they have and how they use their spare time. In short, we would like to know whether they are passive "appreciators" or active "participants" or "producers" of art, music and literature. We should like to ask, Have you ever written a theme or paper that was not required by your teachers and not submitted for credit? Do you play, or have you ever played a musical instrument? Such questions aim at the assessment of student potential for contributing to the cultural values of the society as well as ability to appreciate cultural values.

If we wish to understand the students' attitudes toward the future and success in our culture we shall need to inquire into his vocational goals and hope to discover what may constitute success to him. This, in itself, is of importance in understanding him, but since we wish to assess development through the college years, we need to know how important college is to him in achieving "his success." Obviously, if success, no matter how one defines it, can only be gained through success in college, then college success becomes the "sine qua non" of his life.

Obviously, each of these attitudinal dimensions have many component parts and can be broken down in various ways. The "education-in-general, college-in-particular" category would have a particular interest in our investigation. We hypothesize that a student's attitudes toward college may have something to do with the nature of the college experience for him. If, for example, he feels that college exists to prepare him for a specific vocational role, he may want everything in the curriculum to have an actual or potential relevance to that role. His experiences will likely differ radically from those of a student who regards college as the means of his development as a person. Thus, we may wish to examine the following attitudes:

Attitudes toward the purpose of college

Attitudes toward the role of college student

Attitudes toward faculty members

Attitudes toward his particular college.

Integral to all of the above questions is the complex of attitudes toward his past educational experiences. How has the student responded to his experiences? His responses will no doubt relate directly to motivational matters and color his feelings about his future experiences.

Attitudes toward the role of college student are of greater importance

today than ever before. Recent developments on American college campuses have been marked by student activist movements toward academic freedom for students (lehrnfreiheit) in behalf of civil rights causes, greater participation by students in college governance and policy-making and educational reform. Students, probably for the first time in the history of American higher education, are demanding recognition as responsible adults who should have a voice in the formulation of educational goals and policies and a role in carrying them out. It is not too much to say that students are coming to regard their demands as the rights of full-fledged American citizens. Indeed, many students regard the college campus as an ideal place to practice the full rights and responsibilities of American citizenship. They reject the role of the college as "parentis in loco," and are striving to change long established collegiate administrative attitudes and practices. It follows then, that student attitudes toward politics, economics, racial understanding and tolerance, and the broad social issues facing the nation and the world ought properly to be assessed as significant areas of development.

The current unrest among the student population contrasts sharply with the image of students held by scholars of higher education for more than two decades. During the '50's students were described as "a silent generation." In the middle '60's, and after the so-called "Berkeley riots," students have come to be viewed in another light. Indeed, it is becoming increasingly clear that instead of coming to college without precise identities, students of today often exhibit rather well developed self-concepts. This self-concept, however, although moderately well developed during high school is in the process of continuing development in college. Furthermore, the structure of attitudes toward the self are thought to bear directly upon the student's performance in college. We wish to ask these questions regarding student attitudes toward their self structures: What are the ways in

which students view themselves? How do they feel about the self? Do they feel adequate--do they have sufficient self confidence to meet the intense competition in most of our colleges? What evidence of congruency can be found between their awareness of self which might be called their self-concept, and what might be called the actual self, or objectively-measurable self? And, how do each of these relate to their "ideal self." What evidence is there that students regard their educational experiences as a means of self-realization or self-actualization? Is education perceived as a means for the development of the self, as it is generally perceived by C.S.C.A. colleges?

Probably more basic than any of the above defined "self-structures" is the area of needs and awareness of needs. Here we wish to know how students approach their educational experiences. Do they perceive higher education as a means for the satisfaction of their basic needs, physical, intellectual and emotional? Higher education as the doorway to occupational and earning status, has a relevance even to physical needs--and beyond physical needs to social and psychological needs. Do students perceive these realities? Do students perceive their day by day educational experiences as a rich source of satisfaction for their intellectual interests, curiosity and imagination, or do they regard them as something they must "suffer through" to gain a reward later on in terms of vocational and/or financial success.

Methodology

It is proposed that the answers to the foregoing questions shall be obtained through the use of cumulative records, autobiographies, admission materials, tests, questionnaires, interviews and observation. In a sense, we shall employ the methodology developed in the social sciences for research into institutional functioning and human development. It is proposed that data regarding student attitudes, opinions, interests and activities

will be gathered by means of carefully constructed questionnaires which will be administered year by year, as the class of 1973 proceeds through the college years at each of our twelve institutions. Along with questionnaire data of a structured kind, we shall seek to gather unstructured data through interviews of an open-ended sort to allow students to express themselves directly and hopefully spontaneously.

The freshman questionnaire will include the basic information needed for the study, essentially personal data, demographic factors, socio-economic information and attitude and interest information. The sophomore questionnaire will seek to gather data regarding student impressions of educational experiences and will attempt to assess identification with educational goals and involvement in the educational process. The junior questionnaire will gather data about choice of major area of concentration, information about crystallization of vocational goals, and other factors which might provide information as to how these choices and decisions were arrived at. The senior questionnaire will cover much the same information as the freshman questionnaire so that comparisons may be made for the purpose of measuring change over the four college years.

In order to elaborate the information regarding change, the Omnibus Personality Inventory will be administered to the seniors and comparisons made with freshman responses. The object of assessment procedures designed to cover a four year period, is to gather information which will enlarge our knowledge of the social and psychological processes which make for student development in college.

The third major area of investigation encompassed in this proposal is an examination of the institutions themselves. We have stated that our focus is upon students and their experiences in college. It can be assumed that we shall, by means of our assessment of student perceptions of their

experiences, gain considerable insight into the nature of our institutions. However, it cannot be assumed that student perceptions of the institutions will be congruent with those of the institutions themselves, i.e. the faculty's, administrators' or Boards of Trustees' stated purposes and goals. We are interested in assessing whatever congruency as may exist. We shall, therefore, seek to place side-by-side the students' perceptions of the institutions and the institutions' own stated purposes. Indeed, we shall do more than that. We shall, by means of the College and University Environmental Scales (C.U.E.S.) seek to specify the actual "operant atmosphere" of the institution. This will then be contrasted with the Institutional Functioning Inventory (IFI) findings, which give a measure of faculty perceptions. The outcome should highlight similarities and differences.

In examining the nature of the institutions,we shall wish to determine what the official stated purposes and goals are. We shall also wish to examine the means employed by the institution to achieve stated goals. It has been assumed that the faculty play the major role in accomplishing the institution's educational goals both directly and indirectly. Directly, they interact with students as educational leaders in the classroom and laboratory. Indirectly they serve as intellectual models for students particularly in their scholarly research activities. We shall therefore wish to inquire into the stature of the faculty; educational achievement; experience; and "teaching" vs."research orientation." We shall give particular attention to the ways in which our institutions encourage faculty members to enter into significant interaction with students. We shall wish to note how our institutions encourage and reward faculty for scholarly and creative productivity.

In these various ways we hope to gain insight into the nature of our students, the nature of the educational experiences provided them, and the nature of our institutions: all of these have a direct bearing upon the

development of students through the college years. These data will help us to answer the question: What difference does it make to a student that he attends a C.S.C.A. college in preference to a public tax-supported institution?

Procedures

I. Phase One. The first phase of the study will include the gathering of data regarding students in the following areas:

Input Factors:

1. Academic Achievement
   a. High school grade average
   b. Scholastic Aptitude Test Scores
      1. Verbal
      2. Mathematics
   c. Cumulative record survey, noting areas of greatest achievement, honors, etc.
2. Personality Assessment
   a. Omnibus Personality Inventory administered to all freshmen.
   b. Autobiography--a sample of freshmen
   c. Interview--a sample of freshmen
   d.
3. Attitudes--toward the college experience
   a. College Student Questionnaire I--all students
   b. Interview--a sample
   c. Autobiography--a sample
4. Socio-Economic Background
   a. College Student Questionnaire I
   b. Interview--a sample
   c. Autobiography--a sample

Data will be gathered on the entering freshman classes at our colleges in September, 1969. This data will be gathered and analyzed and a report prepared by June 1st of each year setting forth the findings of the study to that date. This means that there will be three preliminary reports and one final report prepared during the academic year 1974, which will include a one year follow-up survey.

II. Phase Two. The second phase of the investigation will take place during the 1970-71 academic year. The major effort during this year will be to analyze the test and questionnaire data and to attempt to discover, by means of interviews and a questionnaire the nature of the adjustment made to the college setting and the degree of satisfaction or dissatisfaction experienced by the students in their first year.

It is assumed that some students will either decide to withdraw from college because of academic deficiencies or other reasons. It will be the goal of the staff wherever possible to meet with such students before they withdraw to gather data regarding the perceived causes for their withdrawal. Of particular interest to the staff will be the degree of congruency between students' expressed expectations as to: what college is for; what college will be like; what grades they expect to earn; how many hours they expect to study; how they relate to faculty, and students' actual experiences.

In short, the staff will try to assess the impact of the institution on as many students as possible, including dropouts. Assessment of institutional impact, without taking into account those who drop by the wayside cannot be considered adequate assessment

Instrumentation:

1. C.S.Q. II--all students
2. C.U.E.S.--all students
3. Interviews--a sample

III. Phase Three. The third phase of the assessment will include administration of a questionnaire and scheduled interviews to ascertain:

a. Student reactions to college experiences

b. Choice of major area

c. Crystallization of vocational goals--in relation to choice of major subject.

IV. The final phase of the study will include the following procedures:

A. Testing--administration of

1. Omnibus Personality Inventory

2. Strong Vocational Interest Blank

3. Graduate Record Examination

General Aptitude

Advanced Tests

Area Tests

4. C.U.E.S.

B. Cumulative Record Survey to discover

1. Grade point average

2. Grade average in major area

3. Curriculum pursued

C. Interview. A sample of seniors will be interviewed in order to gain a clinical appraisal of a cross section of the senior class. The interview approach here will be used in order to obtain an open-ended, non-structured indication of the students' responses to their college experience and of their criticisms and recommendations. Every effort will be made to allow students simply to talk about their college experiences. The staff will approach this interview with the idea that new insights into unanticipated areas might be gained by a totally unstructured conference at which students may

say anything or nothing as they choose about their college experiences.

V. Follow-up. During the spring term of the year following graduation of the class of 1973, a questionnaire will be sent out to a sample of students in the study in order to discover how many continued on into graduate school, how many became employed, how many entered the military, etc. An attempt will be made to discover whether the graduates feel their education is adequate to meet whatever challenges, academically or vocationally, they confront during their first year out of college.

All of the above data will be analyzed and a comprehensive report written to show the course of development of the liberal arts students at the twelve C.S.C.A. colleges. At the same time, data accumulated in this study will be compared with data on other liberal arts students at other types of institutions to see to what extent C.S.C.A. students are similar to or different from them. In essence, then, this study will seek to understand those factors which bear upon the development of liberal arts students at C.S.C.A. colleges. Given the students as they are when they enter; the educational experiences at C.S.C.A. colleges; the anticipated factors of growth and development; the nature of the institutions with their total "operant atmospheres," what changes will occur and what can account for them? It is with this question that this study will concern itself.

APPENDIX D

DEPTH INTERVIEW

Educational and Personal History

Interviewer: _____

Name: _____
(student)

How are things going at _____ so far?
(college)

_____

_____

How did you happen to choose _____?
(college)

_____

_____

Where is your home? Where were you born and where did you grow up? _____

_____

_____

What schools did you attend?

Elementary _____

Secondary _____

What were they like? Can you describe them? _____

_____

_____

Now that you can look back on your elementary and secondary school experiences, how do you feel about them?

Elementary _____

_____

Secondary _____

_____

What were your strongest subjects? _____

_____

_____

What subjects were difficult for you? _____

_____

_____

Do you feel that your elementary and secondary school experiences prepared you adequately for college? _____

_____

_____

Do you have any hobbies? _____

_____

_____

What are your special interests? _____

_____

_____

Have you decided upon a major field of study? _____

_____

_____

Have you chosen a vocational goal? _____

_____

_____

What part do you see college playing in your life plans? (Reasons for going to college.) _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Now for awhile let's talk about your family:
How did your parents feel about your choice of college?

Father _____

_____

Mother _____

_____

What do you think your parents expect of you in college? _____

_____

_____

How would you describe your: (What kind of person is he/she?)

Father _____

_____

(vocation and education?) _____

_____

Mother _____

_____

(vocation and education?) _____

_____

Do you have any brothers or sisters? _____

What sex are they? brothers _____

sisters _____

How would you describe them? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Now let's talk about you for awhile.

How would you describe yourself? _____

_____

_____

_____

What do you think will be your main sources of satisfaction this year?

Courses? _____

_____

Activities _____

_____

Friendships _____

_____

Others _____

_____

You have been here about a month now. What is the student body like?

_____

_____

_____

_____

Have you made many friends yet? _____

_____

_____

Can you pick out one friend in particular and describe him (her)? _____

_____

_____

What do you think will be your major contribution to the college? _____

_____

_____

APPENDIX E

RATING FORM

Item	1	2	3	4	5
I. Interests					
a. Academic					
b. Athletic					
c. Humanitarian					
d. Opposite sex					
e. Social					
f. Status/power					
g. Vocational					
h. Other					
II. Att., Educ. & Coll.					
a. Schol. values					
b. Voca/Utilit.					
c. Status consid.					
d. Affiliation					
e. Compulsion					
f. Evasion					
II. Presenting Pers.					
a. Good impress.					
b. Lack of tension					
c. Control & bal.					
d. Independence					
e. Reality orien.					
f. Complexity					
g. Flexibility					
h. Sens., warmth					
IV. Personality Charac.					
a. Achieve. needs					
b. Energy level					
c. Mutuality					
d. Persistence					
e. Dominance					
f. Self-awareness					
g. Pers. integra.					
h. Purposiveness					
i. Orderliness					
j. Concentration					

APPENDIX F

CSCA POLICY ON RELEASE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH DATA

Purposes. Institutional research is undertaken in a college or university to promote the internal development of the institution. It collects data that will be useful in the decision-making processes of the institution. Internal utility is its justification rather than public relations or scholarship.

Confidentiality. Since institutional research information is prepared for college decision-making rather than public consumption, it is confidential and should be handled in the same way as confidential data about a person. However, through its appointed channels, the college may choose to release such information publicly.

Comparisons. Institutional information often is most meaningful in comparison with similar data from other institutions. Therefore it often is collected on standardized instruments for which statistics are available describing a normative group of institutions. Intelligent comparisons with a normative group may be made to the extent that the composition of that group is understood. Since data on the normative group have been published, an institution may compare itself with the group through both internal and public releases.

In a cooperative research project, another set of normative data is accumulated, intercollege comparisons among the cooperating schools. Just as published norms belong to the public domain, the intercollege comparisons belong to the cooperative entity. The cooperative entity determines how these norms shall be released and how they may be used. The cooperative entity also determines what information about the cooperating institutions will be exchanged as part of the project design.

CSCA Procedures. In the current CSCA research project the following procedures will apply:

1. Each college will receive and use its own CSQ, OPI, IFI, and other information for its own purposes.

    a. It may choose to release this information for public as well as internal purposes.

    b. It may use comparisons with published test norm groups for internal or public purposes.

2. Each president will receive, through his institutional research representative CSCA comparative data in which all institutions are identified by code. With reference to these reports, only the president is authorized to approve use of the data on his campus. Also, the president is not authorized to permit use of data that identifies another CSCA institution without permission by the president of that institution.

3. When such data are distributed internally, they shall be marked "Confidential: CSCA comparative data were obtained by the college for internal improvement. These data are to be used only within the professional staff, faculty committees, and college board."

Release of Institutional Research Data - page two

4. CSCA research personnel will receive copies of all data collected in the project for analysis and report to CSCA Institutional Research Representatives and the CSCA Board.

5. The CSCA Board will determine the conditions of any release of comparative CSCA data and reports on the project.

Revised 6/2/70 Board meeting

APPENDIX G

CSCA LIBRARY STATISTICS: EARLY REPORTING SYSTEM

Items to be Tabulated and Reported

Library Collection

- No. of Volumes Added
- No. of Volumes Withdrawn
- No. of Volumes Held at End of Year
- No. of Reels of Microfilm at End of Year
- No. of Physical Units of Other Microtext at End of Year
- No. of Periodicals Being Received at End of Year
- No. of Other Serial Titles Being Received at End of Year
- *Volumes per FTE Student
- *Serials per FTE Student

Library Staff

- Professional Librarians
- Other Professional
- Nonprofessional
- Professional Staff Per FTE Faculty x 100

Student and Other Assistance

- Hours of Student Assistance
- Hours of Other Help

Operating Expenditures

- Total Salaries
- Contributed Service
- Wages
- Books and Other Library Materials
- Binding and Rebinding
- Other
- Total
- *Expenditures Per FTE Student
- *Expenditures Per FTE Faculty
- *Expenditures as Percent of Educational and General Expenditures

*Will be tabulated if the necessary data are returned with the Request to Participate in a CSCA Early Reporting System.

9/14/70